

Ser. No. 09/931,649

REMARKS

Applicant graciously appreciates the Office's attention to the instant application. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims of the instant application. This response is believed to be fully responsive to all issues raised in the September 14, 2004 Office Action. Claims 1-6, 9-10, 12-13, 15-17 and 19-31 are currently amended and claims 1-31 are pending.

Oath/Declaration

Applicant appreciates the Office's attention to the papers requesting the addition of two inventors. Applicant notes that the Office requests no further action of Applicant in this regard.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §101

Applicant appreciates the Office's thoughtful comments in light of 35 USC §101 and the Office's suggested amendments to preambles of claims 1, 10, 13, 16, 20, 26 and 30. Applicant currently amends these claims to include "executing on a computer-readable medium", as suggested by the Office. Applicant respectfully asserts that these amendments are solely for the purposes of §101 and that these amendments do not pertain to any art of record.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b): Begole et al.

In the Office Action mailed September 14, 2004, the Office rejected claims 1-4, 7-9, 16-20, 22, 25-26, 29 and 30 as being anticipated by the document entitled "Flexible Collaboration Transparency Supporting Worker Independence in Replicated Application-Sharing Systems", by James Begole et al., ACM, June 1999, referred to herein as the Begole reference.

Ser. No. 09/931,649

Claims 1, 9, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 29, and 30

In response, Applicant currently amends claims 1, 9, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 29, and 30 to indicate that the first framework and the second framework are different types of frameworks. While the instant application discusses various types of frameworks, Applicant has chosen to currently amend claims 1, 9, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 29 and 30 to recite a "bytecode framework" and an "intermediate language code framework".

Applicant respectfully submits that the Begole reference focuses on a single framework, i.e., the JAVA™ framework. More specifically, the Begole reference focuses on "a Java-based collaboration transparency system for serializable, Swing-based Java applications, called Flexible JAMM (Java Applets Made Multiuser)" (Begole reference at page 95). The authors of the Begole reference implemented the Flexible JAMM system on the JAVA™ framework (or what the Begole reference calls "the Java platform") for several reasons:

First, aside from any inherent programming features, Java is especially attractive for writing collaborative software because it simplifies distributing software and largely eliminates platform compatibility issues

Begole reference at page 111.

Thus, the Begole reference discloses and teaches selection of an arbitrary application platform (specifically, the JAVA™ framework) that can run on many different types of computing machines without issues.

Further, in Section 4.1 Procedures and Methods (page 120), the Begole reference compares Flexible JAMM to Microsoft's NetMeeting using a JAVA™ framework-based text editor application called Notepad. Thus, the Begole reference teaches use of a pre-existing JAVA™ framework-based application that is already designed to run on Flexible JAMM and Microsoft's NetMeeting. Yet further, the Begole reference then discusses the merits of its single framework solution (see, e.g., Table IV, page 126). In contrast, the subject matter of the

Ser. No. 09/931,649

1 currently amended claims is directed to methods (or computer-readable media)
2 that allow a code associated with a first framework to operate on a second,
3 different framework. Applicant respectfully submits that the Begole reference
4 does not disclose or teach such subject matter.

5 *Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 17, 18 and 22*

6 Claims 3, 4, 7 and 8 depend on claim 1, which is currently amended.
7 Claims 3, 4 are currently amended for clarity. Thus, for the reasons given above,
8 Applicant submits that claims 3, 4, 7 and 8 are not anticipated by the Begole
reference.

9 Claims 17 and 18 depend on claim 16, which is currently amended. Claim
10 17 is currently amended for clarity. Thus, for the reasons given above, Applicant
11 submits that claims 17 and 18 are not anticipated by the Begole reference.

12 Claim 22 depends on claim 20, which is currently amended. Claim 22 is
13 currently amended for clarity. Thus, for the reasons given above, Applicant
14 submits that claim 20 is not anticipated by the Begole reference.

15 Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a); Begole et al. and Stroustrup

16 *Claims 5, 6 and 8*

17 In the Office Action mailed September 14, 2004, the Office rejected claims
18 5, 6, and 8 as being unpatentable over the document entitled "Flexible
19 Collaboration Transparency Supporting Worker Independence in Replicated
20 Application-Sharing Systems", by James Begole et al., ACM, June 1999, referred
21 to herein as the Begole reference, in view of the text C++ by B. Stroustrup, 1997,
22 referred to herein as the Stroustrup reference.

23 Claims 5, 6 and 8 depend on claim 1, which is currently amended. Claims
24 5 and 6 are currently amended for clarity. Thus, for the reasons given above,
25 Applicant submits that claims 5, 6 and 8 are patentable over the Begole reference
in view of the Stroustrup reference.

Scr. No. 09/931,649

Claims 10-15 and 31

In the Office Action mailed September 14, 2004, the Office rejected claims 10-15 and 31 as being unpatentable over the document entitled "Flexible Collaboration Transparency Supporting Worker Independence in Replicated Application-Sharing Systems", by James Begole et al., ACM, June 1999, referred to herein as the Begole reference, in view of the text C++ by B. Stroustrup, 1997, referred to herein as the Stroustrup reference.

In response, Applicant currently amends independent claims 10, 13, 15 and 31 to indicate that the first framework and the second framework are different types of frameworks. While the instant application discusses various types of frameworks, Applicant has chosen to currently amend claims 10, 13, 15 and 31 to recite a "bytecode framework" and an "intermediate language code framework". Applicant respectfully directs the Office's attention to the reasons presented above as to what the Begole reference discloses or teaches.

Claims 11 and 12 depend on claim 10, which is currently amended, and claim 14 depends on claim 13, which is currently amended. Claim 12 is currently amended for clarity. Thus, for the reasons given above, Applicant submits that claims 10-15 and 31 are patentable over the Begole reference in view of the Stroustrup reference.

Applicant notes that the Office discusses claim 30 in this group as well. For the reasons given above, Applicant submits that claim 30 is patentable over the Begole reference in view of the Stroustrup reference.

Claims 27-28

In the Office Action mailed September 14, 2004, the Office rejected claims 27 and 28 as being unpatentable over the document entitled "Flexible Collaboration Transparency Supporting Worker Independence in Replicated Application-Sharing Systems", by James Begole et al., ACM, June 1999, referred

Ser. No. 09/931,649

1 to herein as the Begole reference, in view of the text C++ by B. Stroustrup, 1997,
2 referred to herein as the Stroustrup reference.

3 Claims 27 and 28 depend on claim 26, which is currently amended. Claims
4 27 and 28 are amended for clarity. Thus, for the reasons given above, Applicant
5 submits that claims 27 and 28 are patentable over the Begole reference in view of
the Stroustrup reference.

6 *Claims 21, 23 and 24*

7 In the Office Action mailed September 14, 2004, the Office rejected claims
8 21, 23 and 24 as being unpatentable over the document entitled "Flexible
9 Collaboration Transparency Supporting Worker Independence in Replicated
10 Application-Sharing Systems", by James Begole et al., ACM, June 1999, referred
11 to herein as the Begole reference, in view of the text C++ by B. Stroustrup, 1997,
12 referred to herein as the Stroustrup reference.

13 Claims 21, 23 and 24 depend on claim 20, which is currently amended.
14 Claims 21, 23 and 24 are amended for clarity. Thus, for the reasons given above,
15 Applicant submits that claims 21, 23 and 24 are patentable over the Begole
reference in view of the Stroustrup reference.

16
17 **Conclusion**

18 Pending claims 1-31 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully
19 requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any
20 issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Office is urged to contact
21 the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

22
23
24 Respectfully Submitted,
25

Ser. No. 09/931,649

Dated:

By: Daniel Hayes #32618
for Brian Pangrle
Reg. No. 42,973
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
(509) 324-9256

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25